



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/686,468

10/11/2000

Nathan A. Torgerson

11738.00001

3373

7590
Scott A Burow
Banner & Witcoff Ltd
10 S Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

06/30/2010

EXAMINER

MENDEZ, MANUEL A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3763

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/30/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/686,468	Applicant(s) TORGERSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Manuel A. Mendez	Art Unit 3763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2009.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) Claims 9-14, 33, 34, 15-20, 35, 36, 21-26, 37, 38, 27-32, 39, 40, and 41-60 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are Claims 9-14, 33, 34, 15-20, 35, 36, 21-26, 37,38, 27-32, 39, 40, and 41-60.

DETAILED ACTION

Reissue Applications

The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective because it fails to identify at least one error which is relied upon to support the reissue application. See 37 CFR 1.175(a)(1) and MPEP § 1414.

Applicant attempts to identify the error by stating that they claimed less than they had a right to claim by failing to claim the use of a plurality of valves or a network of restrictors (or a combination of both). However, the only original patent claim, claim 1, was never limited to anything less than that; this is further evidenced by the presence of dependent claim 5 which further specifies a plurality of valves and a flow restrictor network. Therefore the supposed "error" identified is not in fact an error in the patent as the scope of protection afforded by the patent was never otherwise limited.

MPEP 1414, sections II(B) and II(C) specify respectively:

"In identifying the error, it is sufficient that the reissue oath /declaration identify a single word, phrase, or expression in the specification or in an original claim, and how it renders the original patent wholly or partly inoperative or invalid" and "Any error in the claims must be identified by reference to the specific claim(s) and the specific claim language wherein lies the error." Accordingly, the Applicant must point specifically to the language which caused claim 1 to be too narrow (since they claim they are broadening).

Finally, the only oath filed in the application, on 10/11/2000, is defective for setting forth an improper priority claim. This oath, on page 1, makes a claim under 35

USC 120 to US application 08641363, now US patent 5820589. However, this is a reissue of patent 5820589; and therefore, it does not claim priority under 120 to the patent for which reissue is sought. A new oath should be submitted which omits this erroneous priority claim.

Claims 9-14, 33, 34, 15-20, 35, 36, 21-26, 37,38, 27-32, 39, 40, and 41-60 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue oath under 35 U.S.C. 251 as set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.175.

The nature of the defect(s) in the oath is set forth in the discussion above in this Office action.

Claims 9-14, 33, 34, 15-20, 35, 36, 21-26, 37,38, 27-32, 39, 40, and 41-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based. See *Pannu v. Storz Instruments Inc.*, 258 F.3d 1366, 59 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Hester Industries, Inc. v. Stein, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Clement*, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Ball Corp. v. United States*, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A broadening aspect is present in the reissue which was not present in the application for patent. The record of the application for the patent shows that the broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to claim subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope of claim subject matter surrendered in the

application for the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.

In the original patent, independent claim 1 was amended on December 8, 1997, to specify that the regulator assembly adjustable to a plurality of flow rate settings was "passive". This amendment is directed to limitations relied upon by applicant in the original application to make the claims allowable over the prior art. Therefore, the pending claims must be rejected since the limitations relied upon have been removed from claims 9-14, 33, 34, 15-20, 35, 36, 21-26, 37,38, 27-32, 39, 40, and 41-60.

The amendment filed in 03/19/2009 and all previous amendments propose amendments to claims that do not comply with 37 CFR 1.173(b), which sets forth the manner of making amendments in reissue applications. All markings to show changes made must be made with respect to the original patent to be reissued, not with respect to a previous amendment. Accordingly, all claims newly added to the patent must be underlined in their entirety every time they are presented; likewise all changes being made to original claims must be made with markings to show those changes every time they are presented.

A supplemental paper correctly amending the reissue application is required.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manuel A. Mendez whose telephone number is 571-272-4962. The examiner can normally be reached on 0730-1800 hrs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Nicholas D. Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Manuel A. Mendez/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3763

Manuel A. Mendez
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3763

MM